UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09/269,573 | 07/16/99 | HAYASHIZAKI | Y 024705-083 |

021839 HM12/0323
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| FORMAN, B | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1655 | 19 |

DATE MAILED: 03/23/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/269,573 | Applicant(s) HAYASHIZAKI, YOSHIHIDE | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Examiner BJ Forman | Art Unit 1655 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25 and 27-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25 and 27-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *8 18* .
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 March 2001 has been entered.

2. The papers filed 7 November 2000 in Paper No. 12 in which claims 1, 9 & 28 were amended is acknowledged and the amendments have been entered. New claims 32-33 filed in the Preliminary Amendment of Paper No. 17, dated 12 March 2001 have been entered. The previous rejections in the Office Action of Paper No. 10 dated 11 July 2000 are withdrawn in view of the amendments. All of the arguments have been thoroughly reviewed and are discussed below. New grounds for rejection are discussed.

3. Applicant is reminded that changes to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 require applicant to submit a clean set of all pending claims in addition to the marked up version of the amended claims.

Currently claims 1-25 and 27-33 are under prosecution.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite in the recitations " binding a labeled substance, said substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair" (Claims 1-8, 19-21 & 32); "hybridizing fragments with a substance specifically recognizing" (Claims 9-18, 22 & 33); and "A substance specifically bindable to a mismatched base pair" (Claims 23-25 & 17) because "substance" is a broad term encompassing nucleic acids, nucleic acid binding proteins and chemical compositions so that the meaning of "substance" is unclear and one or ordinary skill in the art would not be apprised of the scope of the claimed invention. It is suggested that the claims be amended to define "substance" as described in the specification i.e. replace "substance" with "protein" (specification, page 7, last paragraph).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 19-21, 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wagner et al. (WO 93/02216, published 4 February 1993).

Regarding Claim 1, Wagner et al. disclose a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing at least one nucleic acid fragment, with at least one nucleic acid fragment of which a mutation is to be assayed; binding a labeled substance, said substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair occurring between the hybridized fragments; and identifying a fragment bound by the labeled substance by detecting the label to thereby detect a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, lines 1-25) wherein the at least one fragment is fixed on a substrate (page 7, lines 4-8) and has all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27). The preceding rejection is based on judicial precedent following In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 because Wagner et al. is silent with regard to the fragment having all of a sequence of a full-length gene. However, the sequence of a full-length gene recited in Claim 1 is deemed to be inherent in the DNA hybridization partner having a mRNA target in Wagner et al. because DNA hybridization partners of mRNA inherently encompass a full-length gene and therefore the DNA hybridization partners of Wagner et al. encompass the sequence of a full-length gene. The burden is on applicant to show that the claimed full-length gene is either different or non-obvious over that of Wagner et al. Alternatively, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the DNA fixed on the substrate of Wagner et al. by fixing a full-length sequence of a on the substrate for the obvious benefit of detecting a DNA mutation within a genomic sample.

Regarding Claim 2, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair is a mismatch binding protein (page 6, lines 13-17).

Regarding Claim 3, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the mismatch binding protein is MutS (page 6, lines 29-31).

Regarding Claim 4, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair is labeled with at least one kind of substance selected from the group consisting of luminescent proteins, phosphorescent proteins,

fluorescent proteins, luminescent substances, fluorescent substances, phosphorescent substances, radioactive substances, stable isotopes, antibodies, antigens enzymes and proteins (page 27, lines 22-32).

Regarding Claim 19, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the fragments of nucleic acid are bound to the substrate only at their 5' or 3' end i.e. via terminal phosphate groups or hydroxyl terminus (page 19, lines 20-33).

Regarding Claim 20, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the fragments of nucleic acid are fixed on the substrate by covalent bonds (page 19, lines 9-10).

Regarding Claim 21, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein said nucleic acid is cDNA i.e. the immobilized nucleic acid is cDNA (page 6, lines 25-26 and page 13, lines 6-9).

Regarding Claim 28, Wagner et al. disclose an article comprising a substrate having a surface on which nucleic acid fragments having all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-28) wherein the fragments are fixed in a hybridizable condition (page 7, lines 4-9). The preceding rejection is based on judicial precedent following In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 because Wagner et al. is silent with regard to the fragment having all of a sequence of a full-length gene. However, the sequence of a full-length gene recited in Claim 28 is deemed to be inherent in the DNA hybridization partner having an mRNA target recited in Wagner et al. because DNA hybridization partners of mRNA inherently encompass a full-length gene and therefore the DNA hybridization partners of Wagner et al. encompass the sequence of a full-length gene. The burden is on applicant to show that the claimed full-length gene is either different or non-obvious over that of Wagner et al. Alternatively, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the DNA fixed on the substrate of Wagner et al. by fixing a full-length sequence of a on the substrate for the obvious benefit of detecting a DNA mutation within a genomic sample.

Regarding Claim 29, Wagner et al. disclose the article wherein said fragments are bound to the substrate only at their 5' or 3' end i.e. via terminal phosphate groups or hydroxyl terminus (page 19, lines 20-33).

Regarding Claim 30, Wagner et al. disclose the article wherein said fragments are bound to the substrate by covalent bonds (page 19, lines 9-10).

Regarding Claim 31, Wagner et al. disclose the article wherein said nucleic acid is cDNA (page 13, lines 4-9).

Regarding (New) Claim 32, Wagner et al. disclose a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: providing at least one polynucleotide fixed on a substrate; a sample comprising at least one nucleic acid fragment of which a mutation is to be assayed; a labeled substance wherein said substance specifically binds to a mismatched base pair resulting from hybridization between a polynucleotide fragment and a fragment comprising a mutation; hybridizing said fragment to said polynucleotide; introducing said labeled substance to specifically bind to any mismatched base pairs; and identifying a fragment bound by the labeled substance to thereby detect a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, line 1-page 7, line 8) and wherein the fragments have all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27). The preceding rejection is based on judicial precedent following In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 because Wagner et al. is silent with regard to the fragment having all of a sequence of a full-length gene. However, the sequence of a full-length gene recited in Claim 32 is deemed to be inherent in the DNA hybridization partner having an mRNA target recited in Wagner et al. because DNA hybridization partners of mRNA inherently encompass a full-length gene and therefore the DNA hybridization partners of Wagner et al. encompass the sequence of a full-length gene. The burden is on applicant to show that the claimed full-length gene is either different or non-obvious over that of Wagner et al. Alternatively, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify

the DNA fixed on the substrate of Wagner et al. by fixing a full-length sequence of a on the substrate for the obvious benefit of detecting a DNA mutation within a genomic sample.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (WO 93/02216, published 4 February 1993) in view of Zoltukhin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,304, filed 18 January 1996)

Regarding Claim 5, Wagner et al. teach a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing at least one nucleic acid fragment, with at least one nucleic acid fragment of which a mutation is to be assayed; binding a labeled substance, said substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair occurring between the hybridized fragments; and identifying a fragment bound by the labeled substance by detecting the label, thereby detecting a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, lines 1-25) wherein at least one fragment is fixed on a substrate (page 7, lines 4-8) and has all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27) and further introducing a label into a nucleic acid fragment to be assayed for mutations (by adding the labeled mismatch-binding protein) and detecting the label to identify the fragment having a mutation (page 6, lines 19-24) but they do not teach the mismatched base pair is labeled with GFP. However, GFP labeled proteins were known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Zoltukhin et al. who teaches the advantages of GFP i.e. it does not require cofactors or substrates and it is small in size

(Column 1, lines 52-59 and Column 8, lines 22-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the GFP label of Zoltukhin et al. to the labeled mismatched base pair binding substance of Wagner et al. for the expected benefit of simplicity by eliminating need for cofactors and substrates as taught by Zoltukhin et al. (Column 1, lines 52-59 and Column 8, lines 22-27).

11. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (WO 93/02216, published 4 February 1993) in view of Gifford (U.S. Patent No. 5,750,335, filed 22 April 1993).

Regarding Claim 6, Wagner et al. teach a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing at least one nucleic acid fragment, with at least one nucleic acid fragment of which a mutation is to be assayed; binding a labeled substance, said substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair occurring between the hybridized fragments; and identifying a fragment bound by the labeled substance by detecting the label, thereby detecting a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, lines 1-25) wherein at least one fragment is fixed on a substrate (page 7, lines 4-8) and has all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27) and introducing a label into a nucleic acid fragment to be assayed for mutations (by adding the labeled mismatch-binding protein) and detecting the label to identify the fragment having a mutation (page 6, lines 19-24) but they do not teach quantifying the fragment having a mismatched base pair. Gifford teaches a similar method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing at least one fragment fixed on a substrate with at least one fragment of which mutation is to be assayed (Column 4, lines 10-23 and 66-67) and introducing a label into a fragment to be assayed to identify and quantify the fragment having a mismatch (Column 21, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the mutation

detection of Wagner et al. with the additional quantitation as taught by Gifford et al. for the expected benefit of detecting and quantifying heteroduplex fragments present as taught by Gifford et al. (Column 21, lines 7-10).

Regarding Claim 7, Wagner et al. teach a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation wherein the label introduced into the nucleic acid fragment to be assayed for mutations (by adding the labeled mismatch-binding protein) and detecting the label of the are carried out in order to identify the fragment having a mutation (page 6, lines 19-24) but they do not teach the a label different from the label attached to the mismatch binding substance. Gifford et al. teach the similar method wherein the label introduced into the nucleic acid to be assayed for mutations produces a signal different from that produce by the label attached to the substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair wherein quantification and identification of the fragment are performed simultaneously i.e. compare to identify and quantify (Column 21, lines 1-18).

Regarding Claim 8, Wagner et al. teach the method wherein the fragment to be assayed is labeled by being bound to a labeled substance which specifically binds to a mismatched base pair wherein the substance is labeled with at least one kind of substance selected from the group consisting of luminescent proteins, phosphorescent proteins, fluorescent proteins, luminescent substances, fluorescent substances, phosphorescent substances, radioactive substances, stable isotopes, antibodies, antigens enzymes and proteins (page 27, lines 22-32) but they do not teach the nucleic acid fragments are labeled. Gifford et al. teach the similar method wherein the nucleic acid fragments to be assayed are labeled with at least on kind of label selected from the group consisting of luminescent substances, fluorescent substances, phosphorescent substances, stable isotopes, radioactive substances (Column 10, lines 33-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the labeling taught by Wagner et al. with the additional label on the

nucleic acid to be assayed as taught by Gifford et al. for the expected benefit of quantifying the heteroduplexes in a sample as taught by Gifford et al. (Column 21, lines 3-6).

12. Claims 9-18 & 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (WO 93/02216, published 4 February 1993) in view of Chirikjian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,178, filed 7 June 1996) and Goldrick (U.S. Patent No. 5,891,629, filed 28 September 1995).

Regarding Claim 9, Wagner et al. teach a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing at least one nucleic acid fragment, with at least one nucleic acid fragment of which a mutation is to be assayed; binding a labeled substance, said substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair occurring between the hybridized fragments; and identifying a fragment bound by the labeled substance by detecting the label, thereby detecting a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, lines 1-25) wherein at least one fragment is fixed on a substrate (page 7, lines 4-8) and has all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27). Wagner et al. do not teach the method wherein a substance which recognizes the mismatched base pair cleaves the hybridized fragments and labeling the remaining fragments. However, Chirikjian et al. teach a similar method for detecting a nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing nucleic acid fragments with nucleic acid fragments of which a mutation is to be assayed treating a mismatched base pair occurring between the fragments with a substance specifically recognizing and cleaving the mismatched base pair labeling the cleaved fragments (Column 9, lines 33-38) and identifying the labeled fragment to thereby detect a nucleic acid having a mutation (Column 3, lines 8-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the mismatch binding protein of Wagner et al. with the mismatch binding protein which cleaves as taught by Chirikjian et al. for the expected benefit of eliminating the

necessity of PCR amplification which introduces spurious point mutations and to thereby detect, identify and localize a nucleic acid having a point mutation accurately, economically and efficiently as taught by Chirikjian et al. (Column 6, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 10, Wagner et al. teach the method wherein said fragment is fixed on the substrate at the 5' end (page 19, lines 20-25) but they do not teach the 3' end of the fragment is blocked and the labeling of the fragment is performed by 3' end addition. However, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the labeling of the cleaved fragment is by a 3' end addition reaction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the labeling reaction of Wagner et al. with the 3' addition reaction of Chirikjian et al. based on mutation being detected for the expected benefit of detecting a point mutation accurately, economically and efficiently as taught by Chirikjian et al. (Column 6, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 11, Wagner et al. teach the method wherein the binding substance is MutS (page 6, lines 29-31) but they do not teach the binding substance is a nuclease. However, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the binding substance is a nuclease (Column 7, lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the MutS binding substance of Wagner et al. with the nuclease as taught by Chirikjian et al. based on mutation being detected for the expected benefit of detecting a point mutation accurately, economically and efficiently as taught by Chirikjian et al. (Column 6, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 12, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the mismatch binding substance is a nuclease comprising numerous nuclease enzymes known in the art (Column 7, lines 1-25) but they do not specifically teach the nuclease is S1 nuclease, Mung bean nuclease or RNase H. However, Goldrick teach a similar method for detecting a mutation comprising: hybridizing a nucleic acid fragment with a fragment to be assayed; treating a mismatched base pair with a substance specifically recognizing and cleaving the mismatch

base pair to cleave; and identifying the cleaved fragment to identify the mutated fragment wherein the cleaving substance is selected from S1 nuclease and Mung bean nuclease (Column 15, lines 2744). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the mismatch-bind substance of Wagner et al. and Chirikjian et al. with functionally equivalent nuclease i.e. S1 nuclease and/or Mung bean nuclease taught by Goldrick based on available reagents, mutation of interest and desired results to optimize experimental conditions to thereby maximize experimental results. The courts have further stated with regard to chemical homologs that the greater the physical and chemical similarities between the claimed species and any species disclosed in the prior art, the greater the expectation that the claimed subject matter will function in an equivalent manner (see *Dillon*, 99 F.2d at 696, 16 USPQ2d at 1904).

Regarding Claim 13, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the labeling is performed by an enzyme reaction utilizing a label i.e. a gylcosylase-associated label (Column 9, lines 33-37).

Regarding Claim 14, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the reaction is 3' addition (Column 9, lines 33-37).

Regarding Claim 15, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the fragment is labeled with a fluorescent substance (Column 9, lines 35-37).

Regarding Claim 16, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein introducing a label into the fragment to be assayed are carried out in order to detect and quantify the fragment having a mismatched base (Column 9, lines 58-65).

Regarding Claim 17, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein quantification and identification of the fragment are simultaneously performed (Column 9, lines 39-52).

Regarding Claim 18, Chirikjian et al. teach the similar method wherein the fragment is labeled with a fluorescent substance (Column 9, lines 35-37).

Regarding Claim 22, Wagner et al. disclose the method wherein the nucleic acid is cDNA (page 13, lines 4-9).

Regarding (New) Claim 33, Wagner et al. teach a method for detecting nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: providing at least one polynucleotide fixed on a substrate; and a sample comprising at least one nucleic acid fragment; hybridizing said fragment to said polynucleotide; treating a mismatched base pair occurring between said hybridized fragment and polynucleotide with a substance that specifically recognizes the mismatch; labeling the fragment; and identifying the labeled fragment to thereby detect a nucleic acid having a mutation (page 6, line 1-page 7, line 8) and wherein the fragments have all of a sequence of a full-length gene (page 6, lines 25-27). Wagner et al. do not teach the method wherein a substance which recognizes the mismatched base pair cleaves the hybridized fragments and labeling the remaining fragments. However, Chirikjian et al. teach a similar method for detecting a nucleic acid fragment having a mutation comprising: hybridizing nucleic acid fragments with nucleic acid fragments of which a mutation is to be assayed treating a mismatched base pair occurring between the fragments with a substance specifically recognizing and cleaving the mismatched base pair labeling the cleaved fragments (Column 9, lines 33-38) and identifying the labeled fragment to thereby detect a nucleic acid having a mutation (Column 3, lines 8-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the mismatch binding protein of Wagner et al. with the mismatch binding protein which cleaves as taught by Chirikjian et al. for the expected benefit of eliminating the necessity of PCR amplification which introduces spurious point mutations and to thereby detect, identify and localize a nucleic acid having a point mutation accurately, economically and efficiently as taught by Chirikjian et al. (Column 6, lines 40-45).

13. Claims 23-25 & 27are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (WO 93/02216, published 4 February 1993) in view of Zoltukhin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,304, filed 18 January 1996) and Fleck et al. (Nucleic Acids Research, 1994, 22(24): 5289-5295).

Regarding Claim 23, Wagner et al. teach a substance specifically bindable to a mismatched base pair wherein said substance is labeled (page 7, lines 10-16) but they do not teach the label is GFP. However, GFP labeled proteins were known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Zoltukhin et al. who teaches the advantages of GFP i.e. it does not require cofactors or substrates and it is small in size (Column 1, lines 52-59 and Column 8, lines 22-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the GFP label of Zoltukhin et al. to the labeled mismatched base pair binding substance of Wagner et al. for the advantages of GFP taught by Zoltukhin et al. i.e. GFP is small in size and does not require cofactors or substrates (Column 1, lines 52-59 and Column 8, lines 22-27).

Regarding Claim 24, Wagner et al. teach a substance specifically bindable to a mismatched base pair wherein said substance is labeled wherein the substance is the MutS protein or a functional derivative thereof (page 6, lines 19-31) but they do not teach the mismatch binding protein binds a c/c mismatch. However, c/c mismatch binding proteins were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Fleck et al. who teach the MutS homologue of *Schizosaccharomyces pombe, swi*4 which specifically binds to c/c mismatched base pairs (page 5292). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify mismatch binding protein, mutS of Wagner et al. with the mutS homologue taught by Fleck et al. for the expected benefit of base-specific mismatch binding as taught by Fleck et al. (page 5294, last paragraph).

Regarding Claim 25, Wagner et al. teach a substance specifically bindable to a mismatched base pair wherein said substance is labeled wherein the substance is the MutS

protein or a functional derivative thereof (page 6, lines 19-31) but they do not teach the mismatch binding protein binds a c/c mismatch. However, c/c mismatch binding proteins were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Fleck et al. who teach the MutS homologue of *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*, swi4 which specifically binds to c/c mismatched base pairs (page 5292). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify mutS mismatch binding protein taught by Wagner et al. with the mutS homologue of Fleck et al. for the expected benefit of base-specific mismatch binding as taught by Fleck et al. (page 5294, last paragraph).

Regarding Claim 27, Wagner et al. the substance specifically binding to a mismatched base pair is labeled with at least one kind of substance selected from the group consisting of luminescent proteins, phosphorescent proteins, fluorescent proteins, luminescent substances, fluorescent substances, phosphorescent substances, radioactive substances, stable isotopes, antibodies, antigens enzymes and proteins (page 27, lines 22-32).

**Conclusion**

14. No claim is allowed.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (703) 306-5878. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:45 TO 4:15.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-8724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

BJ Forman, Ph.D.
March 22, 2001

S Foman